
Citation:

Estol, J and Font, X (2016) European tourism policy: Its evolution and structure. *Tourism Management*, 52. 230 - 241. ISSN 0261-5177 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.06.007>

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/1997/>

Document Version:

Article (Accepted Version)

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Abstract:

This article reviews the procedural complexity of tourism policy-making by the European Commission leading up to the 2010 Communication. Initially, the European Commission had to present interventions affecting tourism as a community action or measure; intended to assist in the implementation of the Internal Market. Later, integration of the sustainable development principle into European Treaties established a framework for governance and a foundation for tourism policy, and the Lisbon Treaty in 2007 established a European policy that explicitly related to tourism, albeit a complementary competence in character. This article highlights a lack of leadership from the Member States throughout the process and contrasts this with the self-serving, driving force of the Commission in making tourism policy that focuses primarily on promotional actions. Consequently, the Commission has not created a robust, dynamic, flexible European model for tourism, designed in a way to best serve the needs of the Member States.

Key words: European integration, governance, sustainable development, Internal Market, Lisbon Treaty

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the end of the Second World War, tourism has been a stable and continuous driver of economic growth in Europe. It has not, however, always been openly welcomed by European Institutions. Only since 2007, when the treaties which reformed the European Union were finally implemented, has there been clearly formulated tourism policy, promoted by the European Commission (EC). That it should have taken so long was partly because Member States were reluctant to relinquish part of their domestic powers to the EU and partly because of the nature of tourism. This article narrates the increasing recognition given to tourism within the EU framework until the creation of the European Tourism Policy.

To understand how this policy was formed requires a comprehensive review of the successes and failures of relevant EC initiatives. The pattern is one of policy created and enacted following EC initiatives by means of internal actions such as Communications. In rare cases, the regulatory initiatives gave birth to Directives, Decisions, Resolutions and Recommendations. The roles of the European Parliament (EP) and the Council of the European Union (COUNCIL) are relevant to the discussion as they are both institutions involved in the legislation process. In addition, the European Economic Social Committee (EESC) and the Committee of the Regions (CoR) were involved as consultative bodies of the European Union, although their acts were not legally binding. EU decision making is complex and the full institutional arrangements are not described within this paper; Lodge (1996) identified at least eight legislative procedures impacting tourism, Manente, Minghetti, & Montaguti (2013) show how multiple EU policies affect tourism, while Wallace, Pollack, and Young (2010) provided a more current and detailed account of the European policy institutional map and instruments. For quick reference, a list of key institutions mentioned in this paper is given in Table 1.

*** insert Table 1

2. TOURISM POLICY PROVIDED BY THE INTERNAL MARKET

We shall first review how tourism was used as a soft target to incentivise Member States to embrace the Internal Market (Robinson, 1993). The internal market, also known as the single market, was an ambitious, and often controversial, project that would remove sovereignty from the states (Garrett, 1992). The integration process led to a gradual transformation from state to shared sovereignty between Member States and European institutions. Raising awareness of the importance of the tourism trade, helped to achieve the Union's objectives for the whole of Europe, as was addressed in the Treaty of Maastricht and subsequently, fully incorporated into the Treaty of Amsterdam. The European Commission and the European Council Acts, which formed the framework of European Tourism Governance for this period, can be found in Table 2.

1. First steps

From the inception of the Community by the Treaty of European Economic Community (TEEC, 1957) (also known as the Treaty of Rome and henceforth referred to simply as 'the Treaty'), and in order to achieve the mission established in art. 2, tourism was considered a *community action*. That interpretation, legally based on art. 235 of the Treaty, allowed the members of the Council to adopt *appropriate measures* if acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission, providing that *the action* of the Community appeared necessary to achieve European Community objectives (now termed EU objectives) and providing that it was within the framework of the Common Market. Following this procedure, EC initiatives dealing with some EU policies, as set out in the Treaty, were to be placed for consultation before the EP and the Economic and Social Committee (ESC now EESC) prior to further approval by the Council. This first period has been studied by Robinson (1996), who commented that it took 25 years for the Commission to make any serious attempt to coordinate tourism policy. The paragraphs below outline the piecemeal stepping stones that led towards this coordination.

It was not until the 1980s that European policies and priority areas affected by tourism were specifically identified (Airey, 1983), starting with a 1982 Communication (EC, 1982) that recognised the importance of tourism in the achievement of the Community's aims. Subsequently, the EC outlined its tourism approach within the Common Market. The EC based its regulatory initiative on the contents of the TEEC-1957 that, amongst other things, established the mission of promoting close relations between the people that make up the Community, acting upon the principle of "appropriate measures" as provided by art. 235 of the Treaty. Within the 1982 Communication the EC defined tourism as a tool to enhance the development of the poorest regions in Europe and recognised tourism as key in achieving parity in the balance of payments within Member States. It emphasised three key policy areas: seasonality, alternative forms of tourism, and social tourism (Robinson, 1996). This approach had few Community-wide effects, as tourism was considered as contributing to balance of payments within individual Member States, rather than having a Community viewpoint (Airey, 1983). The 1982 Communication however left its mark on the consciousness of politicians and tourism was increasingly recognised as impinging upon Community policies (for example, the free movement of people, provision of services, regional development, environmental protection, passenger transport services). The Communication also embodied the EC's general desire to increase tourism within the Community and therefore "it was imperative that Community policies, decision-making and development of activities take into account the interests of tourism" (EC, 1982:5).

The 1982 Communication gave rise to a Resolution (EP, 1984) and an Opinion (ESC, 1983) that marked the transition towards a tourism policy that relied heavily on the idea of improving the Internal Market. A Council Resolution (COUNCIL, 1984) formally allowed the EC to consider the introduction of a tourism dimension into Community decisions and to take initiatives, provided they were based on surveys conducted among Member States. The Resolution was important because, through it, the Council had openly recognised tourism as an *action* and had made it an additional instrument for European integration (Morata, 2004). The integration process introduced tourism as a matter to be shared between Member States and supranational institutions.

Parallel events raised awareness of the desirability of having a tourism policy. In 1985 the EC published the White Paper on the Internal Market (EC, 1985) and the first important reform of the Treaty of Rome came into force with the Single European Act (SEA, 1985), then in 1986 Spain and Portugal joined the European Economic Community. The SEA established the basis for further EU integration, envisaging an area without internal frontiers, with guaranteed free movement of goods, people, services and capital, under the provisions of the Treaty, to be established before the end of 1992 (Ehlermann, 1987). *Consumer protection* was prominent within the Act and today remains one of its pillars, and *partnership* (understood as an arrangement where parties, known as partners, agree to cooperate and advance their mutual interests) was introduced into Community jargon (Tömmel, 1998). The years between the SEA and the 1992 deadline saw the convergence of all Community policies, which provided common objectives, strategies and legislation for all Member States (Aykin, 2012). Tourism grew in importance and was seen as key to the successful delivery, and acceptance by Member States, of the Internal Market. A Communication set out how Community action was to be understood in the context of tourism (EC, 1986a), suggesting to the Council a set of new actions to be considered and, where appropriate, adopted as legislation. Both the EP by Resolution (EP, 1986) and the ESC by Opinion (ESC, 1986) were favourable to all the proposals contained in that Communication; with the ESC containing a specific reference to 'consumer momentum', in which it encouraged the EC to organise a ministerial meeting and prepare a detailed action programme to contribute to the completion of the Internal Market from the perspective of tourism.

As a result, the Council began to respond to the suggestions included in the Communication (EC, 1986) and adopted a Decision "to establish a Consultation and Coordination Process in the field of Tourism" (COUNCIL, 1986a). That Decision, which remains in effect, sought to achieve two objectives: i) to avoid duplication of work done within other Community areas; and ii) To establish a consultation mechanism for cooperation between Member States and the EC. The first step towards defining a tourism policy was the creation of the Tourism Advisory Committee composed of Ministers of Tourism from the individual Member States (this committee remains active today). ☒ However, the committee met infrequently and, surprisingly, did not participate in the preparation of the (unsuccessful) European Year of Tourism in 1989 (Lickorish, 1991) because the EC failed to both consult sufficiently with the private sector or to achieve convergence of the Member States' interests (Greenwood, 1993).

Collectively we see a range of initiatives and legislative activity during the period leading up to the first budget allocation for tourism in Europe (EC, 1988a), resulting in standardised processes and data collection, which were key to enabling joint policy making, as demonstrated in the following four examples. First, the Council adopted a Resolution (COUNCIL, 1986d) that recognised, for the first time, concerns about the risks caused by visitor-saturation (in service quality, local environment and resident

welfare). That Resolution invited Member States to report annually to the EC on actions taken in these areas of concern and Member States were invited to submit details of school holidays and also to identify potential points where, to the detriment of the destination, visitor-saturation of road access might occur. Second, the Council recognised private associations as partly responsible for tourism and, consequently, recognised their right to protect 'their' consumers (COUNCIL, 1986b). The outcome was a suggestion that Member States intercede before national tourism bodies or competent bodies for hotel associations to empower them to take responsibility for the control, collection and publication of all information relating to standardisation. Third, the Council adopted the Recommendation "on Fire Safety in Hotels" (COUNCIL, 1986c) that suggested minimum standards for procedures of and recommended that establishments provide accessible information to customers in order to minimise risk and streamline emergency procedures. The Recommendation suggested that Member States take appropriate legal measures to ensure basic safety levels, with reference to hotels, by implementing periodic inspections. Fourth, some years later, the Council adopted the Package Travel Directive (COUNCIL, 1990) based on consumer regulation (COUNCIL, 1986e), which was intended to boost the sector through legal harmonisation (Grant, 1996) and aimed at protecting consumer-tourist's health and economic interests. This Directive was essentially an instrument for achieving the Internal Market more than a measure designed to serve the interests of tourism entrepreneurs (Aykin, 2012).

In parallel, the policy of economic and social cohesion expanded its focus. The accession of new members required the adjustment of policies to re-balance the effect that completing the Internal Market was having in less developed Member States. Aiming to reduce divergences between Northern and Southern regions (SEA-1985), Regional Development Instruments and Agricultural Policy Guidance Instruments became more far-reaching and 50% of the regional policy budget was allocated to tourism (Pearce, 1988). Within its Agricultural Policy, the EC produced the Communication on "Community Measures to promote Rural Tourism" (EC, 1990) that: i) encouraged the development of rural tourism destinations and the creation of micro-companies, and ii) mentioned networking as essential for the development of the sector.

The first informal ministerial meeting on tourism (1988) encouraged Member States to consider tourism as both a key enabler of Internal Market integration and an opportunity to strengthen the intra-Community area through travel by all its citizens and especially its youth. The statement from that meeting, intended to raise awareness among public authorities, tourism stakeholders and citizens of the importance of tourism for Europe, was one of the first demonstrations of the importance of tourism made by the Member States with a European perspective ([http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release MEMO-88-73 en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-88-73_en.htm)). Yet, despite the positive intentions of that meeting, the Council Decision, made a year later, "on the Declaration of 1990 as the European Year of Tourism" (COUNCIL, 1989) produced piecemeal results even though it was supported by an activity programme with an ECU 5-million budget (Davidson, 1998).☒

*** insert Table 2

2. From Community action to European Community Measures

The Treaty on European Union (TEU, 1992), also known as the Treaty of Maastricht, was a critical incident in the European project (Wallace et al., 2010). The development of tourism policy had crept along until the writing of this Treaty when suddenly it merited the full attention of legislators for the

first time as the definition of Community action devoted a special section to tourism, art. 3, u): "... measures of tourism", although its reference was still weak (Robinson, 1996). The recognition of tourism within this Treaty allowed the EC to act on tourism with more legitimacy, although the unanimity of Member States continued to be required to actually enact some of its proposals, as per art. 235 of TEEC-1957 and TEU-1992. Annexed to the Treaty of Maastricht were 33 Declarations to be taken into consideration in subsequent reforms of the Treaties within the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC). The first, "on Civil Protection, Energy and Tourism", set out an obligation to discuss the possible recognition of a tourism policy in the forthcoming reform of the Treaties. However, despite the efforts of the EC, the legal framework established in 1992 remained the same until the 2009 Lisbon Treaty (TFEU, 2007) was enacted.

Prior to the enactment of the Treaty of Maastricht, the EC presented the Communication on "An Action Plan for Tourism" (EC, 1991), which made an assessment of the first European Year of Tourism, held the previous year, and decided on "the Adoption of an Action Plan in favour of Tourism" (COUNCIL, 1992). It also established an ECU 18-million, three-year plan to encourage the European tourism industry to achieve the completion of the Internal Market. Product quality, destination quality and consumer protection quality were key aspects of this plan, bringing together public and private sectors for greater competitiveness. That Decision, according to the reform of the new Treaty, made express reference to respect for the principle of subsidiarity (EC actions are supplementary to those of the governments of Member States) and to horizontal coordination with other national and Community policies. ☒ In compliance with art. 5 of the Decision of the Council of 1992 the EC published Communication "The EC report on Community measures affecting tourism" (EC, 1994). An informal meeting of the Ministers of Tourism from Member States resulted in the "Green Paper on the Role of the Union in the Field of Tourism" (EC, 1995). Consequently, a public consultation was opened to define how the EU should act on tourism. The EP, alerted by the debate generated by that consultation, passed a Resolution (EP, 1995) expressing regret that Member States had not introduced into the Treaty of Maastricht any provisions on a common tourism policy.

Subsequently, the Council completed its actions on the suggestions contained in the 1986 Communication (EC, 1986) with the adoption of a Directive on "Collection of Statistical Information in the field of Tourism" (COUNCIL, 1995), which proposed a centralised and harmonised instrument to act in international tourism, that could also be used by individual Member States to benchmark competitiveness. The statistical framework enabled the EU, without full membership, to participate in the statistical work of both the United Nations-World Tourism Organization (UN-WTO) and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). This enhanced the EC's visibility in the sphere of international tourism and strengthened its (weak) position in relation to its Member States. Differences between Member States and the EC on European tourism began to decline at this stage.

The reform of the Treaties brought a new opportunity for tourism. A report was produced (ESC, 1996), and consequently an Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) was organised, pursuant to Declaration No 1 TEU-1992 to discuss recognition of tourism policy as one of the new common policies of the reformed Treaty. The process culminated in 1997 with the Treaty of Amsterdam (Amsterdam Treaty, 1997) although there was no progress in the recognition of tourism policy. Tourism was still considered a 'Community measure'.

For its part, the EC had prepared an internal report that referred to the Green Paper regarding the role of the Union in tourism. It described the results of the 1993-1995 Community Action Plan for tourism as precarious and issued a Resolution in which it openly recognised the need for tourism policy, as reflected in this excerpt: "... Whereas tourism can greatly contribute to the economic convergence necessary for the creation of the Economic and Monetary Union by generating employment, redistributing wealth, creating economic development and infrastructure in less advanced areas; whereas it is necessary that, within the strict respect of the principle of subsidiarity, the tourism industry will receive full recognition at European level on the basis of the great principles of sustainable development in terms of social, economic and environmental terms, in order to avoid unfair competition and social dumping ... " (EP, 1996).

Meanwhile, the Council passed a Directive "on The Protection of Purchasers in respect of certain aspects of contracts for the acquisition of a right to use immovable properties on a Timeshare basis"(COUNCIL, 1994) and another Directive on distance contracts (COUNCIL, 1997); both had their legal basis in the functioning of the Internal Market and in the protection of information provided to consumers. Consequently, they were consistent with the reasoning in the Combined Travel Directive published in 1990.

In 1996, the EC introduced a proposal for a Council Decision on "a First Multiannual program to assist European Tourism, PHILOXENIA (1997-2000)" (EC, 1996b) to improve quality and boost competitiveness. It included a new approach for action based on growth and employment that coincided with the new regulations in the Treaty of Amsterdam which were the new reference framework of the EC regulatory initiative regarding tourism measures. The wording was based on a pioneering observance of the cost-effectiveness principle, establishing transnational partnerships in compliance with the sustainable development principle. The objectives of the programme materialised into four parts: i) To improve knowledge in the field of tourism; ii) To improve the legal and financial environment of tourism; iii) To increase European tourism quality; and iv) To increase the number of tourists from countries outside the European Union.✕The EP, ESC and CoR delivered their reports on the PHILOXENIA programme and the results forced the EC to amend its proposal for a Council Decision. However, the new proposal presented by the EC found no unanimity in the Council. Therefore, although the supposed budgetary allocation for PHILOXENIA was estimated at ECU 25-million, the first multiannual programme for tourism was not approved.

3. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND GOVERNANCE: KEY ELEMENTS FOR THE RECOGNITION OF TOURISM POLICY IN THE TREATIES✕

Despite explicitly mentioning tourism as a sphere of action for European integration, the Treaty of Maastricht (1992) left some matters unresolved, which were subsequently dealt with in the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997). Disappointingly, the latter did not formally recognise tourism policy but did introduce resolutions that recognised the sustainable development principle from the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. These resolutions, alongside the introduction of a new approach based on growth and employment, were crucial for the start of a new phase of progressive consolidation of a sustainable development policy for tourism, as reflected in the Multiannual Program PHILOXENIA (EC, 1996b). A list of the European Commission and the European Council Acts that formed the current framework of European Tourism Governance for this period is given in Table 3.

1. A new framework for the construction of European Tourism Policy

The Treaty of Amsterdam introduced '*Employment*' as the new title that marked the launch of the European Employment Strategy (EES), with the objective to coordinate national employment policies. Consequently, in compliance with this and in the same year, the European Summit of Luxembourg for Employment (20-21 November 1997) was held, with the objective of coordinating national policies on employment. With the Treaty of Amsterdam, '*sustainable development*' became an objective to be integrated at all levels, horizontally and vertically, into all policies and actions of the EU. The Treaty also incorporated a protocol on the subsidiarity principle, with the aim of establishing a procedure for its application. This was intended to make it easier for national parliaments to adopt the principle. New governance instruments were therefore being introduced, that would later provide a new political framework for tourism (Anastasiadou, 2011). ☒

One of the most important aspects of the EES was the establishment of a new method of working called the 'Open Method of Coordination' (OMC), which was based on coordination between Member States and the EC, and aimed to promote the exchange of policies and practices among members at different levels. It intended to ensure an integrated approach to maintain consistency in policies relating to employment, social issues, education, taxation, enterprise and regional development. Later, with the introduction of the Lisbon Agenda in 2000 (EC, 2000a), the method would become an *instrument of governance*.

As a result of the Luxembourg Summit, a High-Level Group of experts was created to analyse the contribution of tourism to employment growth and to set up a framework to allow the EC to introduce tourism measures under the framework of the coordination of national employment policies. That High-Level Group produced a Report of recommendations, which explicitly acknowledged the need for a European tourism policy, and invited the EC to coordinate efforts among its Directorates-General to ensure consistent, effective actions. The Report provided analysis on the situation and emphasised the importance of tourism in the EU. One of its recommendations was to organise an *Annual Tourism Summit* to assess the state of the art and to consult stakeholders. It also established *five action areas*: i) To boost tourism business to meet demand; ii) To improve the tourism business environment in order to improve the labour market; iii) To modernise and improve efficiency in infrastructure in relation to tourism; iv) To up-grading human resources in tourism; and v) To promote sustainable tourism development. ☒

In 1999, responding to the demand of the Tourism Ministers Council of November 1997 and to the publication of the High-Level Group Report, the EC prepared a Communication "Enhancing tourism's potential for Employment: Follow-up to the Conclusions and Recommendations of the High-Level Group on Tourism and Employment" (EC, 1999). It formalised the findings of the High-Level Group Report on the contribution of tourism to employment and urged the development of a Community action framework for tourism, as well as the holding of the First Summit on Tourism in 2000. Understandably the Communication was met favourably by the EP, ESC and CoR. The Communication was addressed to sector stakeholders, public authorities and tourism promotion authorities, as well as to the EU itself; thus it ensured that the concept of *partnership* would be completely integrated into the framework of tourism when policy was being made. It also encouraged the creation of interest groups and participation in the process (Anastasiadou, 2008a, 2011) and it promoted the implementation of positive measures to unlock the potential of the sector. The Communication was

structured around five *priorities*: i) Recognition of the impact of tourism on employment growth and sustainable development; ii) The exchange of good practices; iii) The impact of tourism particularly in action plans for employment; iv) Strengthening participation in financing instruments, such as the Regional Development Fund, 5th European Community Framework Programme for Research and LEADER programmes; and v) Cooperation of the Member States with the Institutions.

The text of the Communication "Enhancing tourism's potential for Employment: Follow-up to the Conclusions and Recommendations of the High-Level Group on Tourism and Employment" suggested that the five priorities should focus on delivering concrete *results*, such as: "... the creation of an on-line Tourism Observatory; collaboration with universities and research centres; the creation of networks among tourism companies; improved working conditions and training in the tourism sector; promoting social dialogue among the parties; promoting sustainable and efficient infrastructure to ensure accessibility to destinations and maintain competitiveness; sustainable development and quality standards, as well as introducing environmental practices ... " (EC, 1999:9). This latter part of the Communication enshrined the concept of the 'tourism measures' which had been previously promoted by the EC, and which were to outlined subsequently in the Communication "Europe, the world's No 1 tourist destination - a new political framework for tourism in Europe" (EC, 2010).

In June 1999, the Internal Market Council approved the work done so far by the EC on tourism and recommended the development of a work plan to be developed by Member States, the EC and industry. In 2000, a European Conference of Public Authorities of Tourism was held in Vilamoura (Portugal) as the first support for, and as a test of, future coordination between the EC and Member States. In the subsequent report "Follow-up to Conclusions at the Council on Tourism and Employment" (EC, 2000c), the principle of sustainable and balanced development was envisaged as a component of tourism within the EU framework. On the basis of that report, the EC structured tourism priorities around three themes: "deepening knowledge about trends, needs, obstacles and limitations of the sector; gathering information and identifying existing good practice to ensure access to them and maximum dissemination; improving approaches and strategies developed in the framework of existing policies and measures at national and Community levels" (EC, 2000c:2).

Following the mandate of the Internal Market Council to develop an action plan for tourism, five Working Groups were created and became operative in 2000. The groups were: i) Facilitating exchange and dissemination of information, mainly through new technologies; ii) Improving training in order to upgrade skills in the tourism industry; iii) Improving the quality of tourism products; iv) Promoting environmental protection and sustainable development in the tourism sector; and v) Managing the impact of new technologies in the field of tourism. From the results of the five Working Groups a new framework was progressively consolidated for European tourism governance with new tools. The results of those five groups were synthesised in a discussion paper on future strategies and actions, which formed the basis of the Communication "Working together for the future of European tourism"(EC, 2001b), which was to become a key document.

At the same time, the EC presented a further report on "follow-up of the European Council of 21 September: the situation in the European tourism sector"(EC, 2001c), which reaffirmed the desirability of a tourism strategy to address political and economic challenges, and then in 2002, the Commission issued a working document "on Community measures affecting tourism" (EC, 2002) to complement

the contents of the Communication on “Working together for the future of European tourism” (EC, 2001b) and to summarise tourism actions taken by the EC since the Employment Summit (1999).

2. Definition of instruments for tourism governance

The Communication “Working together for the future of European tourism”, regarded as the foundation stone of sustainable development within the sector, ushered in a new era. Three European Councils set course towards delivering European sustainable tourism policy, consolidating the challenges of growth and sustainable development within the framework of multilevel governance. Firstly in 2000, *the Lisbon Special European Council*, within Lisbon Strategy (now Europa 2020), proclaimed the development of a knowledge-based economy that would be the most competitive and dynamic in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion (Scherl & Cooper, 2013). In 2001, *the Gothenburg Council* aligned sustainable development with the simultaneous achievement of the objectives of economic, social and environmental pillars as they were recognised in the Lisbon Strategy. In 2003, *the Spring European Council* created the Competitiveness Council, to strengthen the economic dimension of the Lisbon Strategy and to improve competitiveness and growth in the context of a competitiveness integrated strategy (EC, 2003a). Also, in 2001 the White Paper “on European Governance” (EC, 2001a) impacted the field of tourism by stressing the importance of stakeholder co-operation and multilevel governance (Parejo Alfonso, 2004). It aimed to increase public confidence in the integration process, to address the issue of EU enlargement, and to respond to the new and different stage in the economic environment that had been created by globalisation. Importantly, it also promoted the OMC reform (EC, 2001d) previously introduced in the European employment strategy.

Collectively the three aforementioned European Councils and the White Paper on Governance constituted an action framework for European Tourism Governance to subsequently accelerate the political process of recognition of tourism as a subject of Community policy. Member States introduced tourism measures and collected data on employment, environmental protection, competitiveness and sustainable development plans by means of the OMC instrument. The EC introduced the *impact assessment* tool to structure and support the development of European policies through evaluating the economic, social and environmental potential of new EC proposals.

The Tourism Advisory Committee began to meet more frequently and the participation of other tourism stakeholders became more regular and organised, as the EC needed transnational interest groups for the provision of technical and specialised information (Anastasiadou, 2008a). Internationally, services, including tourism, were liberalised by the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS, 2000), which affected the implementation of the Internal Market as tourism became an international service. Moreover, the EU launched collaborations with the UN-WTO and the OECD on tourism statistics and on the fight against child sex tourism. Thus the EC continued to consolidate its role as a global partner without needing the support of its Member States.

In parallel to the above activity, in agreements on regional development cooperation the EC introduced the European vision of tourism development. These agreements were formalised in the Communication “To prepare the fourth Meeting of Euro-Mediterranean Foreign Ministers. Reinvigorating the Barcelona Process” held in Marseille in 2000 (EC, 2000b) (Aykin, 2012).

*** insert table 3

3. Alignment with sustainable development

As previously mentioned, the Communication "Working together for the future of European Tourism"(EC, 2001b) laid the legal foundations for the new EC action framework on integrated tourism development within the parameters of sustainable development. That communication was motivated by the legal framework formed by the World Trade Organization's recognition of the subsidiarity principle in the field of tourism and of sustainable development in combination with growth. Acting in accordance with that communication, the EC was entitled to work on tourism measures in coordination with, and with the assistance of, sector stakeholders. It was the beginning of a new phase as the EC had equipped itself with instruments legitimising the process of tourism governance in dealing with Member States (Anastasiadou, 2011). The Communication was consistent with the European strategy for tourism launched in the 80s, as the activities were aimed at improving sector competitiveness, sustainable development of tourism and the creation of jobs. Communication (EC, 2001b) followed the conclusions of the Working Groups and, over time, some of those conclusions became crucial as processes for tourism governance were defined (e.g. the development of an Agenda 21 for tourism; the definition and use of indicators; and satellite accounts).

The next EC Communication was on "Basic orientations for the sustainability of European tourism" (EC, 2003b). Following the legal framework created in the previous Communication, it brought together the results of a 2003 public consultation on tourism measures. Following this communication the EC began seeking consensus on the creation of sustainable European tourism and on increasing European tourism awareness within the future new Member States (from January 2004 the EU membership would include Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia). The EC wished to establish a *multilateral, cooperative and proactive approach* to the design of new sustainability policy for European tourism. Subsequently it stated that a sustainable European tourism industry needed to address "...both consumption patterns, especially seasonal and tourist travel, and production models, that is, tourism offer and destinations. Sustainable tourist behaviour and good public and private governance are fundamental to changing unsustainable tourism models...." (EC, 2003b:3). While this does not fundamentally differ from the policy narrative of the 90s (Manente & Furlan, 1998), the Communication was received as a step towards the *Community measures for tourism* and became a reference document in the exercise of EC regulatory initiatives on policies with a potential impact in tourism. Importantly, the internal coordination also legitimised the EC's position in international relations regarding sustainable tourism development (Aykin, 2012).

In 2004, the Tourism Sustainability Group (TSG) was created to find a balance between competitiveness and sustainable development in tourism through stakeholder and expert participation; as proposed in the earlier Communication, the group was "composed of representatives of the various stakeholders in the sector, with the task of directing and supervising the consistent application of specific activities to be undertaken by these groups ..." (EC, 2003b:16). Its functions were well defined in the Communication, which set the OMC as a working tool and enhanced co-operation and collaboration among group members. ☒ Part of the Communication, as in previous EC Communications since 2000, was addressed to EC (all Directorate General) to which the tourism unit was then assigned. It contained a set of internal, procedural key elements that had to be taken into

account for the proper design of tourism activities, such as using the impact assessment tool (discussed earlier) and developing a cooperation agreement with the UN-WTO.

Another section of the Communication was addressed to the EC as a collegiate body, recognising matters directly affecting tourism and requiring joint action with the private sector to agree on good practices. Such actions had to be coordinated internally first before they could be extended to include the private sector. The Communication also notified the destinations so that they could consider destination management from the viewpoint of sustainable development criteria, as Calvià and Malta had already done at that time. Thus, both the incorporation of environmental policies into destination management and the development of Local Agenda 21s as a palliative response to a decline in mature tourist destinations were decisive actions for the EC when considering those 'local' experiences in the European formulation of sustainable tourism (Dodds, 2007). Finally, the last paragraph of the Communication recognised, implicitly, the need for the EC to have stakeholder collaboration and cooperation in the process of implementing European tourism policy. It became clear that destinations promoting sustainable tourism were more efficient when they had mechanisms to coordinate the actors involved in the tourism process (Butler, 2010) and that good policy formulation not only required the coordination of efforts but also benefited from multi-level governance (Bramwell, 2011).



Through the Communication on "A renewed EU Tourism Policy: Towards a stronger partnership for European Tourism" (EC, 2006) and with the help of three instruments (coordination, cooperation and implementation) the EC specified the path from the previous Communication. Since that Communication coincided with the Renewed Lisbon Strategy (EC, 2005), the EC focused its objective on "...improving tourism industry competitiveness and creating more and better jobs through sustainable growth of tourism in Europe and worldwide..." (EC, 2006:4). Therefore most actions in the 2006 Communication were aimed at improving competitiveness. The EC used that aim when looking for allies (Member States and associations) when strengthening the basis of EC initiatives, and when it needed clear, legal justification for the exercise of its powers within a sustainable development environment (Halkier, 2010). Thus, in response to the objectives of the Lisbon Strategy, the Communication launched an action plan to support small and medium enterprises, which represented the first step towards preparations for a European Agenda 21 for tourism. Concurrently, the plan addressed two different issues in an attempt to improve the competitiveness of destinations: i) It aimed to enhance the visibility of destinations through the creation of a portal on European tourism destinations - the *European Travel Commission*; and ii) It aimed to improve the sector's competitiveness by introducing several measures, the most prominent being the creation of the European Tourism Satellite Accounts. The change in content of policy documents towards sustainability, competitiveness and job growth has been systematically recorded, moving away from employability to sustainability, partnerships and competitiveness (Panyik & Anastasiadou, 2013:195).

4. Towards a European tourism model?

Most actions under the 2006 Communication were achieved, thus raising awareness within the public and private sectors about the opportunity to recognise tourism policy in the next reform of the Treaties. Decisions from different angles, from Community Strategic Directives for rural development (COUNCIL, 2006a:20) to "Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2007 to 2019" (COUNCIL, 2006b) included specific references to tourism. The EC had legitimised their

role in tourism by framing it as sustainable development, and had assigned itself competencies through repeated awareness raising and stakeholder consultations, to the point where, arguably, they had created a European tourism model.

The so-called Agenda 2007 (EC, 2007) was a Communication resulting from the Tourism Sustainability Group task, which, on behalf of the EU, produced a working paper entitled "Action for more sustainable European tourism" that laid the foundations for the later Communication "Agenda 2007 for the development of sustainable tourism for Europe". This, rather complicated, Communication established *goals and objectives* in addition to *principles to be followed* to achieve sustainable and competitive tourism and "... to achieve the objectives of this 'Agenda', namely to achieve economic prosperity, equity and social cohesion, as well as environmental and cultural protection (...) will need to address several unique challenges in the tourism sector (...) sustainable conservation and management of natural and cultural resources, minimising pollution and using resources in tourist destinations, including waste production, managing change in the interests of community welfare, reducing demand seasonality, combating environmental impact of tourism-related transport, making tourism experiences available to all, without discrimination, and improving the quality of jobs in the tourism sector, as well as addressing the employment problem of illegal residents in third countries in the framework of the Commission immigration policy..." (EC, 2007:4).

With the three latest Communications described above, the EC consolidated a framework that constituted a legal basis for the development of a sustainable, competitive European tourism industry. The balance between sustainable development of destinations and tourism development as a competitive activity was well underpinned in that Agenda and was intended to inspire both the Member States and the EC in the formulation of their policies, as well as to engender responsible attitudes in tourists and residents.

The EC created networks of best practice destinations with the aim, primarily, to demonstrate that emerging destinations could self-manage in a sustainable way, but in practice they also focused on the promotion and rebranding strategies of these destinations (Halkier, 2010). This legitimised the role of the EC in cross-national tourism activities and legitimised new Member States as credible sustainable tourism partners. The *European Destinations of Excellence (EDEN)* project was launched as a pilot project in 2006 in the form of a competition amongst destinations. In 2009, the network of sustainable regional destinations in Europe, Network of European Regions for a Sustainable and Competitive Tourism (NECSTouR) was created as a regional initiative funded by the network member regions themselves. NECSTouR received EC political support (but no direct financial support from either EU institutions or Member States) and was based on a voluntary commitment to implement sustainable development principles, in particular honouring Agenda 2007. The network provided important leverage for the formulation of tourism policy and yet, importantly, the 'voluntary participation' statement by the regions was the only guarantee the EC had of consolidating a European tourism model, since tourism remained a Community measure, and therefore the implementation of Agenda 2007 was not compulsory.

With the publication of Agenda 2007, the principles of sustainable and competitive tourism for European destinations, based on the EC approach, were consolidated. With NECSTouR, a platform for dialogue had been created. Thus the EC had created an operating framework for European tourism governance, coordinated by the Tourism Advisory Committee (consisting of Member States) and a

group of experts from all sectors (the Tourism Sustainability Group). They had also enabled dialogue at two different levels of government in the form of EDEN, which included local destinations implementing tourism measures initiated at a higher level and NECSTouR, which consisted of regional destinations, most of which had their own tourism management or regulatory powers. Consequently, these two initiatives reinforced the legitimacy of EC tourism measures. For example, in 2009 the EC did a pilot test in EDEN destinations on sustainable tourism indicators, the results of which helped to reinforce the content of the 'Agenda' Communication. This all responds to the need for evidence-based policy, as at EU tourism policy has been impacted by being behind other sectors in knowledge management arguably because of the lack of European competences in tourism (Scherl & Cooper, 2013).

The various interventions and stages discussed above led to the Treaty of Lisbon, which was adopted in 2007 and came into force from 2009 (TFEU, 2007). With the enactment of this Treaty, the EC effectively launched a new phase as it formally recognised European tourism policy (art. 6 TFEU on principles and art. 195 TFEU on tourism policy) for the first time. The new phase started with the publication of the EC Communication on "Europe, the world's N° 1 tourist destination - a new political framework for tourism in Europe" (EC, 2010).

In 2010 an informal meeting of the Ministers of Tourism was held in Madrid under the theme "Towards a sustainable and competitive European tourism". Its conclusions endorsed the EC initiative which had been expressed in the Communication and which was then forwarded to the Council of Competitiveness and Internal market, Industry, Research and Space (COMP) and to other European Institutions (COMP, 2010; CoR, 2011; EESC, 2011; EP, 2011) for consultation. At the same time, the EC began to develop the Communication 'rolling plan', that is, a timetable within which the objectives of the Communication were to be achieved.

Following the style and content of previous EC Communications, the 'N° 1 tourist destination' Communication grouped actions in favour of tourism around *four themes*: i) To foster tourism competitiveness in Europe; ii) To promote the development of sustainable, responsible and quality tourism; iii) To consolidate Europe's image and visibility as a collection of sustainable and high quality destinations; and iv) To maximise the potential of policies and instruments. Essentially, these were a continuation of actions that had been more or less successful in the past.

Some EC initiatives within the framework of the new European Tourism Policy are worth highlighting. For example, the Decision to establish a "European Union action for the European Heritage Label" (COUNCIL, 2011) recognised the need to promote cultural heritage through tourism, in coordination with the content of the 'N° 1 tourist destination' Communication. The EC also published the "biodiversity strategy to 2020" (EC, 2011) with special reference to tourism; it reinforced aspects of environmental policy and became part of the reference framework for European tourism policy. Another example is the Council Directive on regulation for package travel and assisted travel arrangements (EC, 2013) which revoked the existing Directive which had been published in the 90s. In addition, four years after the TFEU had come into force, the new Multiannual Financial Framework was approved, specifically recognising tourism. Thus, from 2009, a new phase of design and consolidation of European tourism policy commenced.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The establishment of a European tourism policy has not followed the traditional path of other European policies where typically the Authority, according to its general political goals, makes decisions and reorganises the Institutions (Wallace et al., 2010). Tourism policy was never given the importance of other industries such as agriculture, despite generating much more wealth (Robinson, 1996). Its policy making has largely been opportunistic and patchy as a way of coordinating national policies with the EC for the competitiveness of the EU. It responded to the creation of the Internal Market as a first step and then to the introduction of the principles of sustainable development, improved employment and growth. These were means to a higher, institutional end to achieve supranational competences (Panyik & Anastasiadou, 2013). The EU's entry into the international arena reinforced a European vision of tourism, while the completion of the Internal Market was helped by the European integration process among Member States, enlarging the geographical scope and introducing more actors to the design of European policies (Anastasiadou, 2008b; Eising, 2004). Undoubtedly, the drive to formulate a European vision of global tourism and achieve transparency in the planning process and in legislation led the destinations to share tourism information and set common goals (Aykin, 2012) in keeping with the Lisbon strategy (Scherl & Cooper, 2013). The two principles of sustainability and the single market were the drivers of a growing recognition that tourism policy was within the competence of the EC and the EU legislature as opposed to being, as it had been before, within the exclusive competence of individual Member States.

It was with the introduction of the sustainable development principle in the various Treaties that the foundation of this new policy was actually established. Multi-level governance, the open method of cooperation and partnership, and the combination of competitiveness and sustainability allowed, ideally, the creation of an appropriate framework for the design of a European tourism model (Anastasiadou, 2011; Halkier, 2010). It is perhaps too early to analyse the impact that the European sustainability guidelines have had on the tourism policies of individual Member States; moreover, it would be a mammoth task. The tourism action plan, conceived in the 80s and 90s and based on the achievement of the Internal Market, remains a strategy in current European policy and different analysts would disagree on its success (Baldwin, Wyplosz & Wyplosz, 2006). The impact of the EU on tourism has been called a mixed blessing, in part through the difficulties of deciding which European competences are and which are member state competences, and in part through conflicting priorities of the Member States (Anastasiadou, 2006). What is self-evident is that the EU has acquired competences that were formerly reserved to the Member States (Panyik & Anastasiadou, 2013).

The Lisbon Treaty recognises tourism policy in relation to promoting competitiveness by encouraging a favourable environment for the development of undertakings and promoting cooperation between Member States particularly through the exchange of good practices, but with the overall limitation that any harmonisation of the laws and regulations of Member States is excluded (art. 195 TFEU 2007). In discussing the making of tourism policy for destinations we have to take note of the fact that the distribution of competences related to tourism within Member States is not harmonised. Accordingly, the real effect of art. 195 TFEU can only be considered in relation to the promotional actions of destinations at a national level. It does not create a stable environment for the activity of the sector as a whole. As a result stakeholders are still applying pressure on, and intervening in, policy making within the framework of other European policies. So, despite art. 195 TFEU, the EU is conscious that tourism remains a tool or 'common action' for sustainable growth and competitiveness instead of a proper policy that can develop into a European tourism model (Manente et al., 2013). The EC forged a

tourism policy based on sustainable development, their normative framework, instead of setting up a basis for sustainable European tourism because of the lack of Member States involvement or even interest in the evolution of the policy. Therefore, this new Community policy has not been formed in response to the needs of Member States for regulation of activities, protection of public space, diversification of activities or the promotion of residents' experiences of enjoyment or improved welfare, but has simply responded to the need to support the existing European institutions and to build a strong Internal Market.

References

- Airey, D. (1983). European government approaches to tourism. *Tourism Management*, 4(4), 234-244.
- Alfonso, L. P. (2004). Los principios de la Gobernanza Europea. *Revista de Derecho de la Unión Europea*, 1(6), 27-56.
- Anastasiadou, C. (2006). 2 Tourism and the European Union. In D. Hall, M. Smith & B. Marciszewska (Eds.), *Tourism in the new Europe: The challenges and opportunities of EU enlargement* (pp. 20-31). Wallingford: CABI.
- Anastasiadou, C. (2008a). Stakeholder perspectives on the European Union tourism policy framework and their preferences on the type of involvement. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 10(3), 221-235.
- Anastasiadou, C. (2008b). Tourism interest groups in the EU policy arena: characteristics, relationships and challenges. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 11(1), 24-62.
- Anastasiadou, C. (2011). Promoting Sustainability From Above: reflections on the influence of the European Union on tourism governance. *Policy Quarterly Journal*, 7(4), 27-33.
- Aykin, S. M. (2012). A common tourism policy for the European Union: a historical perspective. In P. E. In Burns (Ed.), *Controversies in Tourism* (Vol. 23, pp. 226). Wallingford: CABI.
- Baldwin, R. E., Wyplosz, C., & Wyplosz, C. (2006). *The economics of European integration* (Vol. 2). London: McGraw-Hill.
- Bramwell, B. (2011). Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: a political economy approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5), 459-477.
- Butler, R. (2010). *Sustainability or stagnation? Limits, control, and the life cycle in tourist destinations*. Paper presented at the Sustainable tourism: Issues, debates and challenges, Crete; Technological Educational Institute of Greece.
- COMP. (2010). 3035th COMP, *Council of Competitiveness and Internal market, Industry, Research and Space*. Luxembourg, 11/12.10.2010: Eur-Lex Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- CoR. (2011). *Opinion of the Committee of the Regions opinion 104/3 on Europe, The World's Nº 1 Tourist Destination: A New Political Framework for tourism in Europe*. Brussels, 2.4.2011: Eur-Lex Retrieved from <http://cor.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (1983). *Council Resolution on the continuation and implementation of a European policy and action program on the Environment (1982-1986)*. Brussels, 17.2.1983: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (1984). 84/C 115/01; 84/C 115/02, *Council Resolution concerning a Community policy on tourism*. Brussels, 30.4.1984: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (1986a). 86/664/EEC, *Council Decision on establishing a Consultation and Co-operation Procedure in the field of tourism*. Brussels, 31.12.1986: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (1986b). 86/665/EEC, *Council Recommendation on standardized information in existing hotels*. Brussels, 31.12.1986: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (1986c). 86/666/ECC, *Council Recommendation on fire safety in existing hotels*. Brussels, 31.12.1986: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (1986d). 86/C 340/01, *Council Resolution on a better seasonal and geographical distribution of tourism*. Brussels, 22.12.1986: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (1986e). 86/C, *Council Resolution on the future orientations of the policy of the EEC for the Protection and Promotion of Consumers Interests 1986*. Brussels, 23.06.1986: Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (1989). 89/293/18 ECC, *Council Decision on an action programme for the European Tourism Year (1990)*. Brussels, 17.11.1989: Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.

- COUNCIL. (1990). *90/314/EEC, Council Directive on package Travel, package Holidays and package Tours*. Brussels, 23.6.1990: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (1992). *92/421 CEE, Council Decision on a Community action plan to assist tourism*. Brussels, 13.8.1992: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (1994). *94/47 EC, Council Directive of the European Parliament and the Council on the protection of purchasers in respect of certain aspects of contracts relating to the purchase of the right to use immovable properties on a timeshare basis*. Brussels, 29.10.1994: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (1995). *95/57/EC, Council Directive on the collection of statistical information in the field of tourism*. Brussels, 06.12.1995: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (1997). *97/7/EC, Council Directive on the protection of consumers in respect of distance contracts*. Brussels, 20.05.1997: Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (2006a). *2006/144/EC, Council Decision on Community Strategic Guidelines for rural development programming period 2007 to 2013*. Brussels, 23.10.2006: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (2006b). *2006/1622/EC, Council Decision of the European Parliament and the Council establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2007 to 2019*. Brussels, 24.10.2006: Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- COUNCIL. (2011). *2011/1194/EU, Council Decision of the European Parliament and the Council establishing a European Union action for the European Heritage Label*. Brussels, 22.11.2011: Eur-Lex Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu>.
- Davidson, R. (1998). *Travel and tourism in Europe*. Harlow, UK: Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd.
- Dodds, R. (2007). Sustainable Tourism and Policy Implementation: Lessons from the Case of Calviá, Spain. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10, 296-322.
- EUROPEAN COUNCIL. (1988). Conclusions of the European Council: Rhodes, 2 and 3 December. Reproduced from the Bulletin of the EC nº 12/1988.
- EC. (1982). *COM (82) 385 final, Communication from the Commission on initial guidelines for a Community policy on tourism*. Brussels: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1983). *COM(83) 451 final, Proposal for a recommendation on fire safety in existing hotels*. Brussels, 21.2.1984: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1985). *COM (85) 310 final, White Paper from the Commission to the European Council on Completing the Internal Market*. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1986a). *COM (86) 32 final, Communication of the Commission to the Council on Community action in the field of tourism*. Brussels, 5.2.1986: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1986b). *COM (86) 32 final, Proposal for a Council Decision establishing a Consultation and Coordination Procedure in the field of tourism*. Brussels, 14.5.1986: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1986c). *COM (86) 32 final, Proposal for a Council Recommendation on a standardized information on hotels*. Brussels, 14.5.1986: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1986d). *COM (86) 32 final, Proposal for a Council Recommendation on a better seasonal and geographical distribution of tourism*. Brussels, 14.5.1986: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1988a). *SEC (88) 1580 final, Communication Working Paper from European Commission on priority action to be taken in the tourism sector*. Brussels, 8. 10. 1988: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1988b). *COM (88) 413, Proposal for a Council Decision on an action programme for the European Tourism year (1990)*. Brussels, 17.11.1988: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1990). *COM (90) 438 final, Communication from European Commission on Community action to promote rural tourism*. Brussels, 12.10.1990: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1991). *COM (91) 97 final, Communication from the European Commission on Community action plan to assist tourism*. Brussels, 24.4.1991: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.

- EC. (1994a). *COM (94) 74 final, Report from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee on Community measures affecting tourism* (Council Decision 92/421/ECC) Brussels, 6.4.1994: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1994b). *COM (94) 582 final, Proposal for a Council Directive on the collection of statistical information in the field of tourism*. Brussels, 4.1.1995: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1995). *COM (95) 97 final, Communication of the Commission, Green Paper on the role of the Union in the field of tourism*. Brussels, 4.5.1995: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1996a). *COM (96) 0166, Report on the evaluation of the Community action plan to assist tourism 1993-1995. Council Decision 92/421/EEC*. Brussels, 30.4.1996: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1996b). *COM (96) 0168 final, Proposal of the Commission for a Council Decision on a First Multiannual Programme to assist European Tourism Philoxenia (1997-2000)*. Brussels, 31.7.1996: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (1999). *COM (1999) 205 final, Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Enhancing tourism's potential for employment: "Follow-up to the conclusions and recommendations of the High-Level group on Tourism and Employment"*. Brussels, 28.4.1999: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2000a). *COM (2000) 379 final, Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Social policy agenda*. Brussels, 28.6.2000: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2000b). *COM (2000) 497 final, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament to Prepare the Fourth meeting of Euro-Mediterranean Foreign Ministers. Reinvigorating the Barcelona Process*. Brussels, 6.9.2000: Eur-Lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2000c). *COM (2000) 696 final, Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on progress Report on the follow-up to the conclusions of the Council on tourism and employment*. Brussels, 7.11.2000: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2001a). *COM (2001) 428 final, White Paper from the Commission of the European Communities on European Governance*. Brussels, 25.7.2001: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2001b). *COM (2001) 665 final, Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of Regions on working together for the future of European Tourism*. Brussels. 13.11.2001: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2001c). *COM (2001) 668 final, Report from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of Regions on Follow-up of the European Council of 21 September: the situation in the European tourism sector*. Brussels, 13.11.2001: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2001d). *COM (2001) 727 final, Communication of the European Commission on European Governance -Renewing the Community Method*. Brussels, 5.12.2001: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2002). *SEC (2002) 300, working paper of the Commission, report on Community measures affecting tourism (2000)*. Brussels, 15.3.2002: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2003a). *COM (2003) 704 final, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on some key issues in Europe's Competitiveness – Towards an Integrated Approach*. Brussels, 21.11.2003: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2003b). *COM (2003) 716 final, Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on basic orientations for the sustainability of European Tourism*. Brussels, 21.11.2003: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.

- EC. (2005). *COM (2005) 24 final, Communication of the European Commission to the Spring European Council on Working together for growth and jobs: A new start for the Lisbon Strategy*. Not published, Brussels, 2.2.2005: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2006). *COM (2006) 134 final, Communication from the Commission on a renewed EU Tourism policy: Towards a Stronger Partnership for European Tourism*. Brussels, 17.3.2006: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2007). *COM (2007) 621 final, Communication from the Commission on Agenda for a sustainable and competitive European Tourism*. Brussels, 19.10.2007: Eur-Lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2010). *COM (2010) 352 final, Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Europe, The World's No 1 Tourist Destination – A New Political Framework for tourism in Europe*. Brussels, 30.6.2010: Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2011). *COM (2011) 244 final, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Our Life Insurance, Our Capital: an EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020*. Brussels, 03.5.2011: Eur-Lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EC. (2013). *COM (2013) 512 final, proposal from the European Commission for a Directive of the European Parliament and the Council on package Travel and assisted travel arrangements, amending Regulation (EC) 2006/2004, Directive 2011/83/EU and repealing Council Directive 90/314/EEC*. Brussels, 9.7.2013: Eur-Lex Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu>.
- EESC. (2011). *2011/C 376/08, Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Europe, The World's N° 1 Tourist Destination: A New Political Framework for tourism in Europe COM (2010) 352 final*. Brussels, 22.12.2011: Eur-Lex Retrieved from <http://eesc.europa.eu>.
- Ehlermann, C.D. (1987). The internal market following the Single European Act. *Common Market Law Review*, 24(3), 361-409.
- Eising, R. (2004). Multilevel governance and business interests in the European Union. *Governance*, 17(2), 211-245.
- EP. (1984). *DOC 1-816/83, Resolution of the European Parliament on Measures Affecting tourism*. Brussels, 16.1.1984: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu>.
- EP. (1986). *DOC A2-172/86, Resolution of the European Parliament on establishing a consultation and cooperation procedure in the field of tourism*. Brussels, 12.1.1987: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu>.
- EP. (1995). *DOC (COM (95) 0097–C4–0157/95), Resolution of the European Parliament on the role of the Union in the Field of tourism - Green Paper of the Commission*. Brussels. 4.3.1996: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu>.
- EP. (1996). *(A4-0299/96) Resolution of the European Parliament on European Commission Report on the evaluation of the Community action plan for tourism 1993-1995 - Council Decision 92/421/CEE (COM (96) 0166 - C4-0266/96)*. Brussels: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu>.
- EP. (2011). *2010/2206 (INI), Resolution of the European Parliament on Europe The world's N°1 Tourist Destination, A New Political Framework for tourism in Europe*. Brussels, 26.2.2013: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu>.
- ESC. (1983). *ESC-84-004 EN, Opinion of the European and Social Committee on Tourism*. Brussels, 31.12.1983: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://www.eesc.europa.eu>.
- ESC. (1986). *86/C 328/01, Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee on the Community action in the field of tourism - Communication of the Commission to the Council*. Brussels, 22.12.1986: Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://www.eesc.europa.eu>.

- ESC. (1996). *Report of the Economic and Social Committee on the Intergovernmental Conference 1996 on response to the nº 1 Declaration of the TEU about introducing new matters in the Treaty: Tourism*. Brussels, 21.2.1996: Retrieved from <http://www.eesc.europa.eu>.
- Garrett, G. (1992). International cooperation and institutional choice: the European Community's internal market. *International Organization*, 46(02), 533-560.
- GATS. (2000). S/CSS/W/40 Council for Trade in Services - Special Session - Communication from the European Communities and their Member States. Geneva, 22.12.2000: the General Agreement on Trade in Services
- Grant, D. (1996). The package travel regulations 1992: Damp squib or triumph of self-regulation? *Tourism Management*, 17(5), 319-321.
- Greenwood, J. (1993). Business interest groups in tourism governance. *Tourism Management*, 14(5), 335-348.
- Halkier, H. (2010). EU and Tourism Development: Bark or Bite? *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 10(2), 92-106.
- Lickorish, L. (1991). Developing a Single European Tourism Policy. *Tourism Management*, 12(3), 178-184.
- Lodge, J. (1996). The dynamics of decision making in the European Union. In R. Thomas (Ed.), *The hospitality industry, tourism and Europe: perspectives on policies* (pp. 16-34). London: Cassell.
- Manente, M., & Furlan, M. C. (1998). Quality in the macroeconomic system of tourism. *Tourism Review*, 53(2), 17-28.
- Manente, M., Minghetti, V., & Montaguti, F. (2013). The Role of the EU in Defining Tourism Policies for a Competitive Destination Governance. In C. Costa, E. Panyik & D. Buhalis (Eds.), *Trends in European Tourism Planning and Organisation* (pp. 208-219). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Morata, F. (2004). *Gobernanza multinivel en la Unión Europea*. Valencia: Tirant lo Blanch.
- Panyik, E., & Anastasiadou, C. (2013). Mapping the EU's Evolving Role in Tourism: Implications of the New EU Tourism Competence. In C. Costa, E. Panyik & D. Buhalis (Eds.), *Trends in European Tourism Planning and Organisation* (pp. 189-207). Bristol: Channel View publications.
- Pearce, D. G. (1988). Tourism and regional development in the European community. *Tourism Management*, 9(1), 13-22. doi: 10.1016/0261-5177(88)90054-4
- Robinson, G. (1993). Tourism and tourism policy in the European Community: an overview. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 12(1), 7-20.
- Robinson, G. (1996). Tourism policy. In R. Thomas (Ed.), *The hospitality industry, tourism and Europe: perspectives on policies* (pp. 62-76). London: Cassell plc.
- Scherl, C., & Cooper, C. (2013). Perspectives and Trends on Knowledge Management: European Agencies and Initiatives. In C. Costa, E. Panyik & D. Buhalis (Eds.), *Trends in European Tourism Planning and Organisation* (pp. 326-338). Bristol: Channel View publications.
- Single European Act (1985). Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://www.europa.eu>.
- Treaty of Rome - Treaty establishing the European Economic Community (1957). Country founders: Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands and West Germany. Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://www.europa.eu>.
- Treaty of European Union- Treaty of Maastricht (1992). Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://www.europa.eu>.
- Treaty of Amsterdam, Amending the Treaty of European Union, the Treaty establishing the European Communities and certain related Acts (1997). Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://www.europa.eu>.
- Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community (2007). Eur-lex Retrieved from <http://www.europa.eu>.
- Tömmel, I. (1998). Transformation of governance: The European commission's strategy for creating a 'Europe of the regions'. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 8(2), 52-80.

Wallace, H., Pollack, M. A., & Young, A. R. (2010). *Policy-making in the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford university press.

TABLE N°1 Acts from the European Commission and the European Council, in relation to the Internal Market, up to 1992		
European acts building the European Tourism Policy	Significance for / Impact on European Tourism Policy	Legal framework
COM (82)385 final, Communication on “Initial guidelines for a Community policy on tourism” (ISBN: 92-825-3227-5)	a) It recognised the importance of tourism in the achievement of the Community’s aims. The EC outlined its approach in everything relating to the field of tourism within the Common Market. b) The Council recognised tourism as an action to be considered as an additional instrument for European integration through the COUNCIL RESOLUTION 84/C 115/01 ; of 10.04.1984. Brussels, 30. 4.1984, OJ C115.	TEEC 1957 art 2; TEEC 1957 art 253;
COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1983; on “the continuation and implementation of a European policy and action program on the Environment (1982-1986)” . Brussels, 17.2.1983, OJ C46, p1-6	It recognised that environmental impacts should be considered within the framework of the regional, industrial, transport, <i>tourism</i> , energy and agricultural policies.	
COM (83) 451 final, Proposal for a Council recommendation on “fire safety in existing hotels” . Brussels 21.2.1984, OJ C 49, p7	COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION 86/666/EEC , Brussels 31.12.1986, OJ L384, p 60 on fire safety in existing hotels, 22.12.1986	Council Resolution 84/C 115/01;
COM (86) 32 final, for a Council Recommendation on “standardized information on hotels” . Brussels 14.5.1986, OJ C114, p8-10	COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION 86/665/ECC , Brussels 31.12.1986, OJ L384, p54-59 on standardised information on hotels, 22.12.1986	Council Resolution 84/C 115/01;
COM (86) 32 final, Communication on “Community action in the field of tourism . Brussels, 14.5.1986, OJ C 114 (ISSN 0337-3677)	a) It set out how <i>community action</i> was to be understood in the context of tourism sector. b) First budget allocation for tourism in Europe. c) EC WORKING PAPER SEC (88) 1580 final , Brussels 8.11.1988 on priority action to be taken in the Tourism sector. d) COUNCIL DIRECTIVE 95/57 EC of 23.11.1995 on the collection of statistical information in the field of tourism. e) (COM (94) 582 final , Brussels, 04.1.1995 proposal for a Council Directive on “ the collection of statistical information in the field of tourism ”.	COM (82)385 final; Single European Act 1986 (SEA); White Paper on completing the Internal Market COM(85) 310 final;
COM (86) 32 final, Proposal for a Council Decision “establishing a Consultation and Coordination Procedure in the field of tourism” . Brussels, 14.5.1986, OJ C 114, p11	COUNCIL DECISION 86/664/EEC of 22.12.1986, Brussels, 31.12.1986, OJ L 384 p. 52–53 on establishing a Consultation and Co-operation Procedure in the field of tourism.	TEEC art 235; Council Resolution 84/C 115/01;
COM (86) 32 final, Proposal for a Council Resolution on “a better seasonal and geographical distribution of tourism” . Brussels 14.5.1986, OJ C 114, p7	a) It invited Member States to take measures relating to tourism (assessed the risks of saturation, promoting tourism to develop specific areas). b) COUNCIL RESOLUTION 86/C 340/01 , Brussels 22.12.1986, OJ C 340, p. 1-2 on a better seasonal and geographical distribution of tourism.	Council Resolution 84/C 115/01;
COUNCIL RESOLUTION 86/C; concerning “the future orientations of the policy of the EEC for the Protection and Promotion of Consumers interests 1986” . OJ C 167 p1-2	a) It established a “ new impetus ” programme providing consumers a high level of safety and health protection and an increased ability to benefit from the Community market. b) COUNCIL DIRECTIVE 97/7/EC , Brussels, 20.05.1997, OJ L 144, 04.06.1997, p19 – 27 on the protection of consumers in respect of distance contracts, of 20 may 1997. c) COUNCIL DIRECTIVE 90/314/EEC , Brussels 23.6.1990, JO L158, p-59-64 on package Travel, package Holidays and package Tours, amended by 2008/122/CE directive of the European Parliament and of the Council, Brussels, 03.2.2009.	TEEC art 2;
Conclusions of the European Council (Rhodes) 1988, Conclusions of the European Council 2-3 December 1988	The Council declared the role that the EC should play within the international community to meet the objective of completing the Internal Market.	Internal rules of the European Council;
COM (88) 413 final, Communication on “an Action programme for the European Tourism year (1990)” . OJ C 293 p12, Brussels 17.11.1988	COUNCIL DECISION 89/293/18 ECC , Brussels, 17.11.1988 OJ C293, p.12-56 (Press Release IP/89/891 23/11/1989) on an Action programme for the European Tourism year (1990).	TEEC art 235;

COM (90) 438 final, Communication on “a Community action to promote rural tourism. Brussels 12.10.1990	It introduced geographical criteria for tourism development; and it referred to ERDF to enhance the effects of the regional programmes for developing tourism.	
COM (91) 97 final, Communication on “a Community action plan to assist tourism. Brussels 24.4.1991	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) It referred to the subsidiarity principle and European citizenship, introduced by the Maastricht Treaty. b) It considered different tourism markets within Europe. c) It mentioned the need for tourism statistics in Europe. d) COUNCIL DECISION 92/421 CEE, Brussels, 13.8.1992, OJ L231, p.26-32 on a Community Action plan to assist tourism. 	TEEC art 235;

TABLE N° 2 Acts from the European Commission and the European Council, in relation to Sustainable Development and Governance, 1992-2007		
European acts building the European Tourism Policy	Significance for / Impact on European Tourism Policy	Legal framework
COM (94) 74 final, Report on “Community measures affecting tourism (Council Decision 92/421/EEC)” . Brussels, 06.4.1994	It assessed the impact of community measures until 1994 in compliance with the Decision 92/421 EEC .	Council Decision 92/421 EEC;
COM (95) 97 final, Green Paper on “the role of the Union in the field of tourism” . Brussels, 04.5.1995; ISBN 92-77-87677-8	The first initiative of the EC attempting to recognise Tourism as a European policy.	TEU art 3.t; TEU art 129A, 128; TEU N°1 Declaration about introducing other European policies, tourism among them in the new treaty;
COM(96) 0166, Report on “the evaluation of the Community action plan to assist tourism 1993-1995” Council Decision 92/421/EEC	It lays behind the European Parliament’s resolution analysing the lack of consistency between the strategies of the DGs and the action plan presented by the Commission.	Council Decision 92/421/EEC;
COM (96) 0168 final, for a Council Decision on “a First Multiannual Programme to assist European Tourism Philoxenia (1997-2000)” . Brussels, 31.7.1996, OJ C 222, p.9-12	First tentative step to set up a multiannual programme for tourism.	TEU art 235; COM(95) 512 final of 10 November 1995, Commission’s programme for 1996; Council Decision 86/664/EEC; COM(95) 97 final;
COM (1999) 205 final, Enhancing tourism’s potential for employment. Follow-up to the Conclusions and Recommendations of the High Level group on Tourism and Employment . Brussels, 28.4.1999 ; ISSN 0254-1475	It formalised the report which had been developed by the HLG recognising the need for a European tourism policy.	European Employment Strategy (EES);
COM (2000) 696 final, Report on “progress report on the follow-up to the conclusions of the Council on Tourism and Employment” . Brussels, 07.11.2000	It envisaged the principle of sustainable and balanced development as a component of tourism within the EU framework.	Council Decision 86/664/EEC; Conclusions of the Council of 21.6.1999 (Internal Market) on tourism and employment; Conference of the government authorities responsible for tourism in Vilamoura, Portugal of 11.5.2000;
COM (2001) 665 final, Communication on “working together for the future of European Tourism” . Brussels, 13.11.2001	First communication in which the legal framework was based on European Governance and EES. It introduced the co-operative approach and partnership.	TEU art 3.t; TEU art 2; COM(2001) 428 final, Brussels, 25.7.2001; a White paper from the Commission of the European Communities; Council Decision 92/421/EEC; COM(2001) 370 white paper on European transport policy for 2010; Council Directive 95/57/EC;
COM (2001) 668 final, Report on “follow-up of the European council of 21 September: the situation in the European Tourism sector” . Brussels 13.11.2001	It reaffirmed the desirability of a tourism strategy to address political and economic challenges.	Council Decision 92/421/EEC;
COM (2000) 497 final, Communication on “Reinvigorating the Barcelona Process” . Brussels, 6.9.2002	It introduced the European vision on tourism development.	Barcelona Declaration, 27-28.11. 1995; COM (1998) 538 final on the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership and the Single Market; MEDA Program;

COM – SEC (2002)300, Commission Staff working Paper « report on Community measures affecting tourism (2000) » . Brussels, 15.3.2002	It aimed to complement the contents of the last communication, and to summarise tourism actions done since the Employment Summit.	Council Decision 92/421/EEC
COM (2003) 716 final, NOT FOR PUBLICATION SEC (2003) 1295, Communication on “Basic orientations for the sustainability of European Tourism” . Brussels, 21.11.2003	It launched a Tourism Sustainability Group composed of representatives of the various stakeholder categories. It renewed the approach of having a European Tourism Policy.	TEU art 3.t; TEU art 2; Sustainable Development Strategy (SDS); COM(2001) 665 final;
COM (2006) 134 final, Communication on “a renewed EU tourism policy: Towards a Stronger Partnership for European Tourism” . Brussels, 17.03.2003	It collected the results of public consultation on tourism measures in 2003. It set a framework process to follow for a future consensus based on a multilateral, cooperative and proactive approach.	COM(2005) 24, Lisbon Strategy; SDS for 2005-2010; COM (2005) 97 on Better Regulation for Growth and Jobs; COM (2004) 474 on establishing an integrated action program in the field of lifelong learning; COM (2005) 121 final on establishing a Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Program (2007-2013);
COM (2007) 621 final, Communication on “Agenda for a sustainable and competitive European Tourism” . Brussels 19.10.2007	It established goals, objectives and principles to achieve sustainable and competitive tourism.	Council Decision 86/664/EEC; COM(2001) 665 final; COM(2003) 716 final; COM(2006) 134 final; Lisbon Strategy for Growth and Jobs COM(2005) 24 final; Adapting to climate change in Europe – Options for EU action COM(2007) 354 final; water scarcity COM(2007) 414 final;